RG 22-2
3/1/89

Refugee Reports

A News Service of the U.S. Committee for Refugees
1025 Vermont Avenue NW, Suite 920 Washington, DC 20005 (202) 347-3507

Volume X, Number 1 January 27, 1989

INS SEEKS TOUGHER APPROACH ON ASYLUM, WORK AUTHORIZATION, TRAVEL, BUT FACES LEGAL CHALLENGE

Efforts by the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) to prevent onward travel for asylum seekers applying at the Harlingen INS office near the Mexican border have been halted at least until the end of January by a U.S. district judge.

The INS policy under challenge was put in place on December 16 in response to a dramatic increase in the number of Nicaraguan and other Central American asylum seekers entering the United States and applying for asylum at the INS office in Harlingen (see Refugee Reports, Vol. IX, No. 12).

Before December 16, the INS office in Harlingen had allowed asylum applicants filing there to travel onward, so that their cases could be adjudicated at other INS offices, many of which are located in metropolitan areas where the applicants would have vastly improved chances of finding legal assistance and other support.

By requiring that asylum applications be examined at the office where they were first submitted, the new policy, in effect, made further travel impossible. Extra INS examiners and support staff were sent to Harlingen to examine the applications quickly. The plan was that every applicant would be interviewed by an INS examiner before being granted work authorization. The examiner could deny work authorization if he found the claim to be frivolous.

The INS policy did not provide for a means to feed or shelter those who would be forced to wait near Harlingen, an economically depressed area on the southernmost tip of Texas, while their asylum applications were pending.

Soon after the policy took effect, the numbers of Central American asylum seekers in the Harlingen area grew, and their living space became increasingly cramped, uncomfortable, and unsanitary. Hundreds were staying in makeshift camps in fields, occupying abandoned buildings, crowding downtrodden hotels, and overwhelming church shelters.

U.S. District Judge Filemon Vela halted the INS policy on January 9 by issuing a temporary restraining order. That order freed hundreds of Central Americans to move to Miami, Los Angeles, and other places where

IN THIS ISSUE:

On this, our tenth anniversary issue, Refugee Reports looks at several policies now being considered that are of critical importance to the future of asylum and refugee admissions. In the lead story, Bill Frelick examines the internal discussions at INS that led to a change in policy with respect to Nicaraguans. In the first Recent Development, Court Robinson looks at the factors that weighed in an Administration decision to shift 7,000 FY 89 refugee admission numbers from Asia to the Soviet Union.....1

- Update 5
- Recent Developments

Numbers shift from South and Southeast Asia to the USSR; Canada embarks on more restrictive asylum policy; Court bars return of Afghan refugees to India.....6

- Meetings and Conferences
- Resources 14
- Statistics

Planned Adjustments to FY 89 Funded Regional Refugee Admissions Ceilings.....16

they are more likely to find work, have the support of family and friends, and the assistance of legal counsel.

In Miami, a panic set in after the temporary restraining order, as busloads of Nicaraguans began arriving. The rate of arrivals of Nicaraguans and other Central Americans coming to Miami was probably not much greater than it had been over the course of the past several months (see Refugee Reports, Vol. IX, No. 12). But the impact of more than 200 Nicaraguans arriving in a fleet of Greyhound buses from south Texas was seen in Miami as a dramatic harbinger of things to come. Officials in Miami, with an estimated 100,000 to 150,000 Nicaraguan exiles, were predicting the arrival of 100,000 more in 1989. Mayor Xavier Suarez sought an emergency meeting with President Reagan, as well as with President-elect Bush, who happened to be fishing in the Florida keys at the time.

On January 13, the Miami Herald ran a lead editorial, "The Crisis Upon Us," which opened: "Within the next 48 hours, the droplets of Nicaraguan arriving in Miami will become a rivulet. Within days, that rivulet probably will become a torrent. It has the potential of swelling into a tidal wave that would engulf Greater Miami, causing social and economic destruction more severe than any American city anywhere has ever experienced."

On January 16, Martin Luther King Day, race riots broke out in Miami, touched off by the shooting of a black motorcyclist by a Hispanic police officer. The riots represented the boiling over of a host of tensions and grievances, but they were attributed, in part, to resentment in some sectors of the black community to the Nicaraguan influx.

INS Stance on Nicaraguans Shifts after Departure of Attorney General Meese Internal INS and Justice Department memoranda indicate that the December policy shift had been brewing for at least a month, as INS and Justice Department officials sought ways to modify a policy set forth by former Attorney General Edwin Meese that appeared to give Nicaraguan asylum applicants more favorable treatment than others from Central America.

In July 1987, Meese had said that Nicaraguans with a well-founded fear of persecution would not be deported, and called for an expedited process of granting work authorization to Nicaraguan asylum seekers (see Refugee Reports, Vol. IX, No. 8).

On December 2, Associate Attorney General Francis A. Keating wrote a memo to INS Commissioner Alan C. Nelson entitled "Texas Border Situation." The memo expressed deep concern at reports of large numbers of Central Americans, primarily Nicaraguans, crossing the border near Harlingen, and urged him to take immediate steps to augment the Border Patrol presence to deter illegal entries, and to increase INS examination capability at Harlingen to make possible on-the-spot adjudication of asylum claims.

Keating also said that he would urge "a prompt recission of the August 1987 memorandum" establishing the special Nicaraguan program, which he called "a contributing factor to the current situation."

A December 5 internal INS memo entitled "Nicaraguan Asylum, Harlingen Situation," from INS Deputy Commissioner James Buck, directs the INS staff to marshal arguments "which Keating may use to support the argument for recission of the Meese memo regarding Nicaraguans."

Memoranda Indicate Variety of Deterrent Measures The measures taken on the border to stem the onward travel of Central American asylum seekers fit within the context of a series of long- and short-term proposals being considered within INS to reduce the number of asylum applicants currently pending nationwide.

In addition to acting upon all asylum requests in the jurisdictions where they are

For refugees, and for all who work for refugee protection and who take such joy in their safe return home or in their resettlement, the deaths of five Southeast Asian school children in California last week were particularly hard to bear. All of us at the U.S. Committee for Refugees dedicate our work on this tenth anniversary issue of Refugee Reports to the families, the friends, the teachers, and the classmates of these children.

Central American refugees wait outside the INS office in Harlingen, Texas for their asylum applications to be processed. New York Times/*Wendy Watriss*

filed, the short-term measures proposed in an INS memorandum included other changes: reviewing all asylum applications on a last-in, first-out basis; reviewing all asylum applications before granting work authorization; and immediately communicating to INS field offices that "the Meese memorandum of July 1, 1987 [regarding Nicaraguans] does not require automatic granting of work authorization to asylum applicants whose claims are frivolous."

Intermediate actions proposed in the memorandum included: using all possible detention capabilities; increasing border enforcement; requesting the Justice Department to rescind its Nicaraguan deportation review policy; and pressuring the State Department to "secure the assistance of Mexico and Central American countries to slow down the flow of illegal aliens into the United States."

Suggested long-term actions included: charging fees for asylum and work authorization requests; giving INS district directors greater discretion in issuing work authorization; identifying "carefully selected offices where asylum applications will be accepted"; and considering increased refugee processing in Central America. "Seek additional refugee numbers in this area if needed," the memorandum suggests.

The December INS memo lists the expected results and benefits of these proposed changes, such as an overall decline in work authorization, more expedited asylum determination, and a reduction of caseload in Miami, Los Angeles, and San Francisco. The memorandum states, "The free ride which smugglers and their clients now have out of the Harlingen area will be disrupted, if not stopped."

Robert Rubin, managing attorney of the Immigrant and Refugee Rights Project of the Lawyers' Committee for Urban Affairs in San Francisco, told Refugee Reports, "What the INS calls a "free ride", we call "freedom of movement"; those they term the clients of smugglers, we call "refugees". Rubin is the lead attorney on the lawsuit bringing a temporary halt to the INS policy in Harlingen.

Government Fails to Follow Administrative Procedures Act An important element of the lawsuit, according to Rubin, is that the

government failed to follow the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) of Notice and Comment, which requires the government to publish proposed rules and allow the public to comment before promulgating final rules that represent significant changes in government policy.

"It's a very democratic idea," said Rubin, "to say that the government has to talk with the people who will be affected by their policies before putting them into effect."

Back in 1982, the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) was challenged on the basis of this law when it tried to cut refugee cash assistance from 36 to 18 months without first publishing a proposed rule change in the Federal Register. Some $5 million in benefits were restored to refugees in California.

Had the INS followed the APA, Rubin suggests, they would have seen the impact these changes would have had on Texas. "They would have had to go down and talk to local officials in Texas, who would have asked, 'Are you really interested in creating homelessness for 5,000 refugees?'"

Rubin said that further legal challenges to the INS plan will be raised, especially due process issues, such as denial of financial, emotional, and legal support and assistance to applicants restricted from traveling.

The INS would not comment on their approach to the temporary restraining order. "Our response will be in court," said Verne Jervis, an INS spokesman.

Work Authorization Likely Key New Battleground The INS has attributed the sharply increased number of asylum applicants to the granting of work authorization. A December 5 cable from INS Deputy Assistant Commissioner Ralph Thomas instructed INS field officers that asylum applications do not also constitute requests for work authorization. The cable said that work authorization requests must be made in writing by the asylum applicants.

The cable clarified the meaning of "frivolous" as a basis for determining whether or not to deny work authorization. "Determination of frivolity can be made on the basis of either the asylum application and supporting documentation or on these and oral statements made at the time of interview," Thomas said.

He directed that, barring unusual circumstances, applications should be presumed frivolous if the claim comes from (1) an individual "from a country where the government does not have a pattern of government sponsored persecution, does endeavor to prevent private persecution, and has a judicial system which is equitable and fair;" or if (2) the asylum applicant "is unable to specify any of the five grounds of persecution (race, religion, nationality, political opinion, membership in a particular social group);" or if (3) the applicant is ineligible for asylum on other legal grounds.

INS Pushes for Tougher Standard in Granting Work Authorization In a December 13 memorandum to Attorney General Dick Thornburg, INS Commissioner Nelson said, "Asylum applications have almost tripled in the past year due primarily to the more permissive approach to work authorization."

He said, "Additionally, when the standard for granting employment authorization to asylum applicants was lowered from requiring an applicant to establish a prima facie claim to eligibility to merely a nonfrivolous claim, it was anticipated that abuse would follow."

A prima facie standard is seen as more burdensome than the nonfrivolous standard by attorneys in and out of government.

Nelson urged that steps be taken "to prevent the existing situation" and to avoid having it proliferate.

Rubin challenged Nelson's memory on work authorization. "He is flat out wrong," said Rubin. "The regulations [governing work authorization] never said anything about prima facie standards for work authorization. It is incomprehensible how the INS Commissioner can erroneously report that too many have been given work authorization because the standard has been liberalized."

Work Authorization Could Become Discretionary Rubin said that even more significant than the contemplated change from a nonfrivolous to a prima facie standard for work authorization is a proposal being discussed by INS and the Justice Department making the grant of work authorization discretionary rather than mandatory.

Prior to a September 1986 suit, Diaz v.

INS, federal regulations provided that the INS could, in its discretion, grant work authorization to nonfrivolous asylum applicants. However, the Diaz decision stopped the INS from relying on its discretion to deny work authorization based on the applicant's manner of entry; failure to seek apparent safe haven in a third country; or whether the alien was responsible for the economic support of others. INS discretion in the granting of work authorization to asylum applicants was subsequently removed in federal regulations relating to work authorization.

"Our fear is that discretion will be the black hole within which work authorization will disappear," said Rubin.

A memorandum from Nelson to Keating on October 3 lends credence to this fear. In that memo, Nelson attributed the "chief cause" of the increase in asylum claims in FY 88 as "the change from a discretionary grant of employment authorization to a mandatory grant of employment authorization." He said, "We must end this abuse of the asylum system both to maintain the integrity of the asylum process and to prevent the entry of illegal aliens into the United States labor market consistent with the Immigration Reform and Control Act."

INS Memo Calls for Revamping Asylum Regulations--Less Central Control and Oversight

The October 3 memo from Nelson to Keating and the December 13 memo from Nelson to Thornburgh both propose significant revisions in proposed federal regulations governing asylum. The proposed asylum regulations have had a somewhat rocky history (see Refugee Reports, Vol. VIII, Nos. 9 and 11 and Vol. IX, No. 4). The latest version in April would have created a corps of specially trained asylum officers who would have been supervised by the INS central office. Critics of current INS practice--under which INS district directors make initial asylum determinations--welcomed the April 1988 proposed regulations for stressing the training of asylum adjudicators and for creating a more uniform approach nationally.

In his memo to the Attorney General, Nelson "strongly" recommends that asylum officers be supervised by INS district directors, rather than by the central office.

In the October 3 memo, Nelson wrote, "There is no inherent conflict between the enforcement concerns of the district director and his supervision of Asylum Officers."

The December 13 memo also urged that the Asylum Policy and Review Unit (APRU) in the Department of Justice be disbanded. Calling the unit "just plain financially wasteful," Nelson said, "the entire purpose of APRU and its continued existence should now be reviewed by your staff."

Roger Pilon, former director of APRU and now of the Cato Institute, defended the office, telling the Orange County Register, "The INS has a border patrol mindset. It finds it very difficult to shift gears when faced with a human rights case." Pilon noted several compelling cases in which the APRU intervened to prevent the deportation of refugees slated for removal by the INS.

Loye Miller, director of the Justice Department's public affairs office, told Refugee Reports that the APRU has been included in the FY 90 budget request at a level equivalent to last year's, suggesting that it will continue to operate.

INS spokesman Jervis would not comment on internal discussions of possible changes to the proposed asylum regulations.

Update

° At least three people were killed, and more than 4,000 residents of a Khmer Rouge refugee camp in Thailand were forced to evacuate when heavy artillery shelling hit Borai camp on the evening of January 20, according to a report in the New York Times. The attack, apparently by Cambodian government or Vietnamese forces, was presumed to be in retaliation against increased Khmer Rouge activity in the area, according to relief officials.

In the last six months, Khmer Rouge authorities have removed up to 12,000 civilians from Otrao camp in the northern sector of the Thai-Cambodian border, and another 8,000 from the southern camp of Ta Luan, and forcibly transferred them to "repatriation villages" inside Cambodia.

As Vietnamese troops continue to pull back from the border in anticipation of a withdrawal from Cambodia, the Khmer Rouge reportedly are moving in to take control of

the territory.

In mid-November, shelling near Ta Luan left dozens dead and an estimated 300 wounded, but the Khmer Rouge denied the Red Cross access to provide medical assistance.

° On January 10, an explosion of unknown origin occurred in the Lutheran-church assisted repopulation project in Panchimilama, La Paz department, El Salvador. One Salvadoran was killed, and five injured, including an American and a Canadian.

Although there is no evidence linking the two occurrences, a bomb exploded on December 28 in the church office of Lutheran Bishop Medardo Gomez. Gomez's ministry has largely been devoted to displaced persons within El Salvador. In 1983, he was arrested, together with the head of the medical clinic, at the Fe y Esperanza (Faith and Hope) displaced persons camp run by the Lutheran church outside San Salvador. Some former residents of that camp now live in Panchimilama. The number of threats issued by right-wing death squads seemed to be on the increase in December. In one, the Mano Anticommunista Centroamericana (Central American Anti-Communist Hand), threatened "devilish religious workers."

° On January 25, the Immigration and Naturalization Service announced that it will build a four-mile ditch along a flat section of the Mexican border to deter illegal automobile traffic, according to a report in the Washington Post. Planned to measure 5 feet deep and 14 feet wide, the ditch will cost an estimated $2 million.

The idea drew immediate criticism from immigrant advocates. "It's a symbol, sort of like the Berlin Wall," said Jose Garza, acting vice president for litigation of the Mexican American Legal Defense and Education Fund. "That kept people in and this keeps people out."

A report from the Federation for American Immigration Reform (FAIR), however, supported the ditch idea and called for even more extensive deterrent measures. "Locking uninvited gatecrashers out is just good common sense," the FAIR report said.

° On January 3, the INS announced that it would continue until March 1, 1989 extended voluntary departure (EVD) status--nondeportation--for Polish nationals who have been in the United States since July 21, 1984. The announcement said that the 60-day extension "allows for the an orderly conclusion to the EVD program." In December 1987, legislation was passed establishing a special legalization program for Poles, Afghans, Ethiopians, and Ugandans who had entered the United States by July 21, 1984. The 60-day EVD extension provides time for those eligible to apply to adjust to permanent resident status. Application for the legalization may be made through December 22, 1989. Nearly all of the 7,000 Poles protected by EVD will be eligible for legalization.

Recent Developments

U.S. SHIFTS 7,000 REFUGEE NUMBERS FROM ASIA TO THE SOVIET UNION

In a controversial finale to eight years of refugee policymaking, the Reagan Administration announced that 7,000 refugee admissions numbers from Southeast Asia and the Near East have been transferred to the Soviet Union, where the backlog of refugee applications has reached 17,000. The cuts, which encountered strong protest from refugee groups, are particularly heavy in the Orderly Departure Program (ODP) for Vietnamese, which dropped by 5,500. The admissions ceiling for refugees in Southeast Asian asylum countries fell by 1,000, and the regional ceiling for the Near East and South Asia lost 500 (see chart on page 16).

At the outset of the fiscal year, the U.S. government allocated 18,000 admissions slots for refugees from the Soviet Union. The transfer raises the Soviet ceiling to 25,000, which will be used principally to admit Jews and Armenians.

The December transfer of numbers was necessary "to prevent backlogs from building to unmanageable proportions and to ensure that the next Administration and Congress have adequate time to consider what policies to pursue," said U.S. Coordinator for Refugees Jonathan Moore in a December 15 letter to the Senate Judiciary Committee.

Last April, the Administration authorized an additional 15,000 admissions spots for refugees from the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, but did so by raising the

overall ceiling for FY 88, rather than transferring numbers from other regions.

The U.S. Embassy in Moscow is receiving about 3,000 refugee applications per month, the bulk of them from Soviet Armenians.

The great majority of Jews who leave the Soviet Union do so with Israeli visas. At a transit point in Rome, they are given the choice of continuing on to Israel or applying for resettlement in another country. About 90 percent now choose to come to the United States, and application rates in Rome are about 2,500 per month, according to the State Department.

Roughly 50,000 Soviet applicants are projected by the end of FY 89, said Moore, who acknowledged that the transfer was a "short-term strategy, not a long-term solution."

Criticism from several refugee advocacy groups suggests that the Administration may have succeeded in creating two problems where before it had only one.

"Stopgap measures such as reallocating refugee slots from other regions do not solve the problem and, in fact, may harm refugees from other areas," said the heads of the American Jewish Committee (AJC) and the Indochina Resource Action Center (IRAC) in a joint letter to outgoing Secretary of State George Shultz.

"Rescue of Indochinese refugees must remain a priority," said the letter signed by AJC president Theodore Ellenoff and Le Xuan Khoa, president of IRAC. They urged the Administration to consult with Congress in order to secure additional refugee admissions numbers and funding for the current fiscal year.

Numbers May Go Unused Elsewhere, U.S. Says Defending the decision, Moore said, "We are proposing to reallocate only numbers that might not be used in any event." About 3,000 of the ODP numbers were to be used for the resettlement of reeducation camp prisoners, he said, but negotiations with the Vietnamese government had yet to bear results. The other 4,000 numbers included in the transfer were part of a "semi-funded" allocation "for which only limited federal funding is available," and their use could be problematic in any region, Moore said.

Last July, the Vietnamese government announced that it would permit as many as 50,000 former reeducation camp prisoners and their family members to emigrate to the United States. But only three weeks later, Vietnam suspended the agreement, to protest what it called a "hostile" policy statement by a senior State Department official.

For many years, the U.S. government has had a standing offer with Vietnam to resettle political prisoners, but only about 3,500 former prisoners and their families have left through ODP since the program began in 1979. "We had hoped," said Moore, "that including numbers for them in the FY 89 refugee ceiling would be taken as a sign of our continued willingness both to negotiate and to resettle these persons whenever [the numbers] were made available."

So far, Vietnam has not responded, but "should there be a sudden change in the Vietnamese position after January," Moore said, "it will still be possible to make numbers available for the detainees."

The 4,000 "semi-funded" numbers involved in the transfer are part of 6,000 such numbers provided for in the FY 89 worldwide refugee admissions ceiling. The State Department has no funding for transportation or initial resettlement, so use of the numbers is based on a particular refugee community's ability to cover these costs with private resources. But unlike the fully private admissions numbers--4,000 of these are also included in the FY 89 ceiling--the semi-funded numbers have federal funding available for cash and medical assistance, and social services through the Office of Refugee Resettlement in the Department of Health and Human Services.

"We have no experience with the use of such numbers," Moore said in the Senate letter, "and cannot be positive whether we will be successful in getting them used this year." All 6,000 of the semi-funded numbers have been allocated to the Soviet Union, but Moore indicated that they could be used in other regions as well if private funding becomes available through the Near Eastern or Asian refugee communities.

ODP Cut Sends a "Negative Signal" The ODP ceiling of 25,000 that was originally established for FY 89 provided for the admission of 13,000 refugees--principally family reunification cases and former U.S. government employees and associates--which represented a substantial increase from last year's ODP ceiling of 8,500. Also included were 12,000

(continued on page 10)

U.S. REFUGEE AND ASYLUM PROGRAMS AND POLICIES: A 1988 CHRONOLOGY

The following is a chronology of U.S. program, policy and legislative decisions affecting refugees and asylum seekers during 1988.

January 1: Beginning today, and lasting through February 28, 1989, the government is temporarily prohibited from deporting, excluding, or denying visas to aliens based solely on "beliefs, statements, or associations which, if engaged in by a U.S. citizen in the United States, would be protected under the Constitution. The prohibition is a result of legislation temporarily repealing sections of the McCarren-Walter Act of 1952, which have permitted the government to bar the admission of foreigners on various grounds, including political beliefs, "sexual deviation," polygamy, and insanity.

January 4: The FBI begins reviewing the detention status of 2,100 Cubans at six federal detention facilities to determine each inmate's level of involvement in the rioting and hostage-taking at the federal detention center in Oakdale, Louisiana, and at the Atlanta Federal Penitentiary.

February 1: As of this date, and for the duration of FY 88, federal reimbursement to states for refugee cash and medical assistance costs will only be provided for a refugee's first 24 months in the United States, rather than 31 months.

March 3: The Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) tells state refugee coordinators that in FY 88, there will be a 38 percent cut in funding for state administration of refugee programs. The result, according to state refugee officials, will be the closing of state refugee programs in up to 11 states, the elimination of key services in others, and an overall increase in welfare dependency rates, which had fallen in FY 87.

March 15: By a vote of 88-4, the Senate approves a legal immigration bill that would provide for an annual ceiling of 590,000 immigrant visas, of which 470,000 would be reserved for family immigration and 120,000 for "independent" immigrants. Refugee admissions would not be subject to the immigration ceiling.

March 21: The Department of Justice announces that Polish, Afghan, Ugandan, and Ethiopian nationals who have been protected by extended voluntary departure (EVD)--a temporary reprieve from deportation granted by the Attorney General--will be able to adjust their status to that of temporary resident aliens, if they have been present in the United States since July 21, 1984.

April 6: Ambassador Jonathan Moore, the U.S. Coordinator for Refugees, reported to Congress the President's proposal to raise the FY 88 refugee admissions ceiling based on "an unforeseen refugee emergency" requiring an additional 15,000 places for refugees from the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe.

April 6: The Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) proposes a revised version of its regulations governing asylum adjudication in the U.S. Proposed are a corps of specially trained asylum officers to conduct nonadversarial interviews with asylum seekers. Those denied asylum would be permitted to reopen their asylum applications with immigration judges in deportation or exclusion proceedings.

April 29: Ruling in a class action suit, Orantes-Hernandez v. Meese, a U.S. District Court judge orders the INS to stop employing threats, misrepresentation, subterfuge, or other forms of coercion to induce Salvadorans to accept "voluntary departure" to El Salvador.

May 4: The INS receives more than 1.5 legalization applicants prior to May 4, the end of the general amnesty registration. Voluntary agency personnel estimate that more than 80 percent of Salvadorans in the U.S. were not eligible for the legalization.

May 24: The Western Region of INS is ordered by a California federal court judge to release any child under its detention to his parent, guardian, or "other responsible adult party," if the child is otherwise eligible for release on bond or recognizance. The judge stipulates that any minor

taken into INS custody must be afforded a hearing to determine probable cause in his arrest and on the need for any restrictions placed on his release.

June 13: The Cuban-American National Foundation (CANF) signs an agreement with the U.S. government under which CANF will privately sponsor up to 600 refugees for admission to the United States this fiscal year, the first group in modern times to sponsor refugee admissions to the United States without federal funding.

July 4: The United States abruptly suspends refugee processing out of the U.S. embassy in Moscow, which has been the route of entry for almost all Armenians leaving the Soviet Union under the U.S. refugee program. Less than two weeks later, however, the State Department partially reverses its position to allow an additional 400 people to emigrate.

July 27: INS proposes a revision in asylum procedure allowing immigration judges to limit the scope of evidentiary hearings on certain asylum claims in exclusion or deportation proceedngs. If an asylum applicant had "participated in the persecution" of others, committed a "serious crime" in the U.S., or poses a "danger to the security of the U.S., immigration judges would not need to consider evidence of the applicant's fear of persecution if returned to his home country.

August 14: An emergency supplemental appropriations bill (P.L. 100-393) is signed into law, which provides an additional $24 million for emergency refugee migration and assistance in FY 88. Of this, $6 million covers admissions of another 3,000 Soviet refugees in FY 88. The remainder supplements overseas assistance programs, primarily in Africa.

August 24: ORR reduces the period of eligibility for refugee cash assistance (RCA) and refugee medical assistance (RMA) from 18 months to 12 months.

September 30: For the first time since 1976, Congress passes all 13 federal budget appropriations bills prior to the start of the new fiscal year. Included is $794,306,000 for refugee assistance overseas, admissions, and domestic resettlement assistance.

October 5: President Reagan authorizes the admission of up to 94,000 refugees in FY 89, 10,000 of whom would enter the country with either partial or no funding from the government.

October 5: The House of Representatives passes the Temporary Safe Haven Act of 1988, which would establish criteria by which the Attorney General can grant temporary safe haven in the United States to nationals of countries experiencing armed conflict or other dangerous conditions.

October 13: The Family Support Act of 1988 (PL 100-485) is signed into law. Among other provisions, it requires states to provide 12 months of both transitional child-care assistance and Medicaid benefits for most families who leave public assistance rolls as a result of employment.

November 1: President Reagan signs into law the Genocide Convention Implementation Act of 1988, making genocide or attempted genocide a federal crime.

December 8: U.S. Attorney General Thornburgh announces he has expanded his parole authority to admit up to 2,000 Soviet emigres per month from Moscow plus all Soviet emigres in Rome who cannot be admitted to the U.S. as refugees.

December 13: The Reagan Administration announces that it has removed 7,000 refugee admissions numbers from Southeast Asian and Near Eastern regional allocations and transferred them to the Soviet Union, to accomodate growing backlogs in Jewish and Armenian applications.

December 16: Facing a dramatic increase in the number of Nicaraguan and other Central American asylum seekers passing through Harlingen, Texas, INS decides to revise its policy and begin extraordinary measures to adjudicate claims at the Mexican border.

December 24: About 400 Haitians are sent home after being intercepted by the U.S. Coast Guard as they attempted to sail to the United States.

Amerasians, who, for a two-year period created by special legislation passed in December 1987, enter the country with immigrant status, but are eligible for domestic refugee benefits.

With the Amerasian figure untouched by the cut, the ODP refugee ceiling falls to 7,500, below the FY 88 level. Some observers believe that the transfer of ODP numbers will lead to increased boat departures from Vietnam which can only heighten regional tensions.

"At a time when much progress has been achieved in making the ODP a viable and effective program," said Khoa in a January 10 letter to Moore, "the transfer of numbers sends a negative signal indeed," not only to the asylum countries in Southeast Asia, but to the United States' resettlement partners, and to Vietnam as well. "Such a precipitous transfer hints that Indochinese refugees--especially those seeking to leave Vietnam in a safe and orderly fashion--are not of priority concern to the United States," Khoa said.

Since ODP was established in July 1979 as an alternative to clandestine and dangerous flight by boat, more than 150,000 Vietnamese have departed their country legally, with about 60,000 coming to the United States. But in January 1986, Vietnam unilaterally suspended interviewing for the U.S. program, and demanded that U.S. officials clear up a backlog of 22,000 cases before any new ones would be made available. For the next 20 months, ODP movements continued, but at a slower pace, as the program bogged down in political bickering and policy shifts.

By the time ODP interviewing resumed in September 1987, boat departures were on a fast track. In the twelve month period that followed, more than 50,000 Vietnamese fled their country, principally to Hong Kong, Malaysia, and Thailand. Some of the asylum countries, in turn, responded to this new outflow with harsh new deterrents: boat pushbacks, state-sanctioned violence, and inhumane detention.

As the countries in Southeast Asia and the international community search for ways to preserve asylum for refugees while bringing to an end the dangerous and disruptive boat flows, a healthy ODP is seen increasingly as the cornerstone of any comprehensive solution.

"It is true that few political prisoners have been allowed to leave," said Shep Lowman, president of Refugees International, "but there are tens of thousands of others who are qualified to use the ODP refugee numbers. Despite clear indications that the Vietnamese are willing to cooperate in expanding the program and strong pressure from the asylum countries that this be done," Lowman told Refugee Reports, "the United States goes ahead and cuts ODP refugee numbers to last year's level."

Alternatives Proliferate for Soviet Emigres In order to accommodate the substantial backlog of Soviet applications, which already has people waiting up to one year in Moscow for a U.S. interview, Administration officials have proposed a variety of alternatives to refugee admissions backed with full federal funding.

On December 8, Attorney General Dick Thornburgh authorized the use of parole status for up to 2,000 Soviet emigres per month in Moscow, as well as any Soviets in Rome "who cannot be admitted under current constraints." Jewish groups in the United States generally have opposed the use of parole, saying it leaves people in a state of legal limbo.

A State Department spokesperson acknowledged that parole, which is a discretionary status, does have "serious disadvantages." Although parolees do receive work authorization, they are unable to adjust their legal status to that of permanent resident alien unless they qualify under other provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

To remedy this disadvantage and as an alternative to parole, the State Department announced that it was drafting legislation to establish a new category of immigrant, for groups who do not meet either refugee or regular immigration criteria. According to draft language of the proposed bill obtained by Refugee Reports, up to 30,000 "special immigrant" visas would be available each year for people whose admission "is in the foreign policy interests of the United States." The bill would also allow all parolees who entered the country in 1989 to adjust their status to lawful permanent resident.

In an effort to reduce backlogs within the Soviet Union, an Immigration and

Naturalization Service (INS) officer returned to Moscow on December 13 after a six week absence to resume refugee processing. In addition, the numbers now available for the Soviet Union have been "front loaded," the State Department said, so that the entire annual allocation will be used in the first six months of the fiscal year, in order "to help relieve immediate pressures."

To supplement the number of refugees whose entry into the United States is fully supported by federal funding, up to 6,000 semi-funded numbers, along with about 2,500 fully private admissions spots, will be available for Soviet refugees in FY 89, the State Department said. A letter given by the U.S. Embassy in Moscow to Soviet applicants states, "Increasingly, Soviet citizens who immigrate to the United States will be asked to establish that they, with the assistance of their U.S. sponsors, will be able to support themselves without financial assistance from the United States... You should begin now to discuss finances with your relatives in the United States."

While some of these alternatives may be inevitable, Jewish groups in the United States are clear about their preference. "The only solution to this desperate crisis of refugees is to increase the overall ceiling, and funding," said a statement released by the National Jewish Community Relations Advisory Council, which comprises 13 national and 114 community agencies.

But will the Bush Administration seek additional refugee numbers and budget, given its campaign promises to reduce the federal deficit? This question was put to Secretary of State James Baker by several senators in his confirmation hearing before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on January 19. "No decision has obviously been made," Baker said. "We really have more seeking admission now than we have the capacity, in terms of financial resources, to admit." He added that "we'll probably be coming back up here looking for some money."

CANADA'S MORE RESTRICTIVE ASYLUM SYSTEM IN PLACE

A more restrictive procedure for determining the refugee status of asylum seekers went into effect in Canada on January 1, resulting in the first deportation order under the new law on January 6.

Under the new law, asylum seekers first have to pass eligibility and credibility hurdles before their asylum claims are actually heard (see Refugee Reports, Vol. VIII, Nos. 3 and 6 and Vol. IX, No. 8).

All claims will now be determined by an immigration department adjudicator and a member of a newly created Immigration and Refugee Board, which is independent of the immigration department.

Those persons meeting the eligibility and credibility standards are now being admitted pending determination of their claims, and, according to the Canadian immigration department, will be permitted to work. Aliens not deemed credible or eligible are being deported. Those who appeal negative decisions will be removed from Canada pending a court decision on whether it will hear the appeal.

At a press conference on December 28, Minister of Employment and Immigration Barbara McDougall said, "I want to state categorically that removals will take place." The first person to be deported was an Indian who arrived in Canada on January 1. He was ordered deported on January 6, following a negative finding by the two-person panel.

The Indian, whose name was not revealed, was allowed 72 hours before leaving the country, since he entered Canada by air. Those applying at border crossings from the United States will be removed immediately upon a negative decision. In fact, the interviews will take place at the border crossing points themselves, so that rejected claimants will not have actually entered Canada.

Is the United States a "Safe Third Country?" One of the most controversial aspects of the new law was the notion of "safe third countries." This holds that if a refugee claimant passed through a country determined to be safe before entering Canada, he would not be eligible for consideration as a refugee in Canada, but would be returned to that country without having had his case heard.

As yet, the Canadian cabinet has not come up with a list of safe third countries. However, McDougall said, "At the present time, I am prepared to proceed with no country on the safe third country list."

Many nongovernmental organizations in Canada have expressed concern about the likelihood that Canada would designate the United States a safe third country and return Central American asylum seekers to this country.

In October, the Canadian Section of Amnesty International submitted a report to the chairman of the Immigration and Refugee Board of Canada which notes numerous cases in which bona fide Central American refugees at risk of torture or execution upon return to their home countries have been considered as economic migrants by the United States. Amnesty says the asylum seekers are "strongly discouraged from applying for asylum, or even coerced into accepting voluntary departure." It contends that U.S. detention policies prevent many Central Americans from effectively pursuing their asylum claims and says that the high standard of proof often required from Central American asylum seekers in the United States is "unreasonable."

The Amnesty report said the Canadian government assertions that it would not return genuine refugees "are meaningless if the definition of safe third country is questionable and the procedural safeguards to determine which countries are truly safe are inadequate."

Amnesty concluded that "if the Canadian Government were to send Central American asylum seekers to the United States to have their refugee claims determined there, this would increase the risk that Central Americans might be returned against their will to a country where they risk being arbitrarily detained, made to disappear, tortured, or executed."

The INS district director in Buffalo, New York, Benedict Ferro, told the Toronto Globe and Mail on January 7 that refugee applicants turned down in Canada at U.S. border crossings would face immediate U.S. deportation proceedings. "The vast majority of the ones we've processed in this area have been economic [migrants]," he said.

Therefore, although a refugee claimant has the right to appeal his Canadian rejection while in the United States, the U.S. government is under no obligation not to deport him while he is awaiting a decision on his appeal.

Asylum applicants who are admitted to Canada for a second hearing and then are denied asylum by Canada will not be accepted by the United States, and will, therefore, have to be deported to their homeland or some other country willing to take them.

It is even theoretically possible that an asylum seeker waiting on the U.S. side of the border for an initial interview in Canada could be deported from the United States before having that first hearing. This is unlikely, however, given that the procedure in Canada is working at a faster pace than U.S. deportation procedures, and because informal agreements have been made by immigration services on both sides of the border to time U.S. deportation orders to coincide with the Canadian hearing dates. However, several asylum seekers awaiting their initial interviews have been detained on the U.S. side by the INS since the new policy went into effect, according to the January 24 Toronto Globe and Mail.

Backlog of Cases Strains System Questions were raised last year about how Canada would handle the backlog of about 85,000 asylum applications pending at the end of 1987, with many guessing that the government would declare an amnesty for those who entered before January 1.

At her press conference, McDougall put such speculation to rest when she declared, "There will be no amnesty."

McDougall said that each applicant would be individually assessed for the credibility of his claim. She said that the process would start immediately and last about two years.

"Those judged credible by independent process will be allowed to apply for permanent residence," she said. "Those who cannot establish credibility of the refugee claim will face removal after due legal process, unless they leave voluntarily."

About 40 percent of the people in the backlog (33,907) have been in Canada less than six months. Sharp increases in arrivals of asylum seekers were reported before the beginning of the new year.

COURT BARS RETURN OF AFGHAN REFUGEES TO INDIA

A federal appeals court has ruled in favor of two Afghan refugees who were threatened with deportation to India by the Immigration

and Naturalization Service (INS), despite the fact that India had indicated that it was not willing to accept them and could not give advanced assurance that they would not be returned to Afghanistan.

The two Afghans, Amanullah and Wahidullah, fled to India in 1983 after having been imprisoned in Afghanistan for their participation in anti-government demonstrations. When traveling to Canada in 1985, their flight made a stopover in New York, where they were apprehended by the INS. In exclusion proceedings, they applied for asylum before an immigration judge, who denied asylum and withholding of deportation despite a finding by the State Department's Bureau for Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs that they had a well-founded fear of persecution upon return to Afghanistan.

They dropped their appeals when assured by INS that they would be not be deported to Afghanistan. However, in May 1987, when they were threatened with deportation to India without assurance from the Indian government that they would be accepted and not returned to Afghanistan, they challenged the government, which was enjoined from deporting them by a district court. The U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, in Boston, heard the government's appeal.

On several occasions, the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) commented on the case, saying that the two Afghans would be at risk of refoulement (forced return) if deported to India without advanced assurances that they would not be returned to Afghanistan.

In July 1987, the Indian embassy wrote to the INS saying that the two Afghans would not be accepted by India and that India does "not accept the theory of the so-called 'country of first refuge obligation.'"

Although the three judges concurred in Amanullah and Wahidullah vs. Cobb that the United States could not return the Afghan refugees to India without advanced assurances that it would not subject them to refoulement, they arrived at the same conclusion by different reasoning. While not able to agree on interpretation of the statutes in question, nor on the principle against indirect nonrefoulement, they were able to agree that since the INS had assured Amanullah and Wahidullah that they would not be deported to Afghanistan, and, since that promise could not be assured if they were to be returned to India, "the government should not be permitted to renege."

Judges Discuss Rights in Exclusion Versus Deportation Proceedings The legal disagreements seemed to hinge, for the most part, on differing interpretations of the law as it relates to excludable aliens--those whom the United States has refused to admit--as opposed to deportable aliens--those aliens who are already in the country and whom the United States is seeking to expel.

Judge Pettine found what he interpreted as a parallel provision in the statute relating to deportable (as opposed to excludable) aliens to the effect that "Congress required that there be prior inquiry to and assurances from that country that it was indeed willing to accept this alien." He reasoned that Congress intended to establish a common procedure for excludable and deportable aliens in this regard. "Congress could not have intended to permit the United States government to engage in the practice of placing refugees in orbit: in flight from country to country, none willing to accept them," he wrote.

Judge Coffin took a middle position, saying, "We are hampered by a certain congressional schizophrenia" because, in his view, the statutes relating to deportation and exclusion are not parallel. Nevertheless, he said, "I agree that it is sheer folly to send an alien to another country without any indication that the country will receive the alien, or, as in this case, where there is explicit notice that it will not accept the individual."

Judge Coffin also complained that the case presented a confusion of facts as well as a confusing statute. He said that the INS never clarified what procedures it commonly follows in such cases--whether, for example, the aliens are escorted or not, or how the United States determines what the third country does once it has the alien.

Judge Aldrich wrote that Judge Pettine made a "serious mistake" in holding that the same precondition must be met for excludable and deportable aliens. "This, I believe," wrote Aldrich, "disregards both the substantive difference, and interests, between refusing admission to an illegal alien, and expelling one that is already here."

Arthur Helton, director of the Political Asylum Project of the Lawyers Committee for Human Rights, who made the oral argument before the circuit court, said that the decision was significant because it could protect scores of other refugees from being sent to third countries.

"This is a victory not only for these Afghans, but for other refugees who may fall into this lacuna in protection," he said.

Deborah Anker, a lecturer at Harvard Law School and chair of the Refugee and Asylum Committee of the American Immigration Lawyers Association, said that the case "is most significant for the great weight placed on UNHCR's 'expertise' and knowledge regarding India's refoulement practices."

Meetings and Conferences

° "Amerasian Resettlement: Strategies for Success" is a conference to be held March 7-10, 1989, at the Radisson Hotel, Richmond Virginia.

The Conference is being convened by the U.S. Catholic Conference, under a grant from the Office of Refugee Resettlement.

Designed for practitioners, the conference will focus on a practical and clinical understanding of the emotional, educational, physical, employment, and religious needs of Amerasians and their family members, and organizing community resources to meet those needs.

Service providers will share their experiences and develop strategies for successful Amerasian resettlement.

The conference is being coordinated on behalf of USCC by Joanne Marcus, Program Director of the Connections Program at Catholic Charities, in Richmond. For more information, contact her at 4206 Chamberlayne Avenue, Richmond, Virginia 23227, (804) 264-2771.

° The International Counseling Center will hold its fourth national conference on May 23-24, 1989, at the Marvin Center, George Washington University, Washington, D.C.

The theme is "Crossing Cultures in Mental Health: Issues for the 90s." Mary Catherine Bateson will deliver the keynote address, and lectures and workshops will be presented by leaders in the fields of cross-cultural counseling and human services. Workshops will focus on topics such as the dynamics of transition and adaptation of refugees and immigrants, the special concerns of multi-ethnic clients, and the skills and competencies needed by professionals to counsel or deliver services across cultural lines.

For further information, please contact the International Counseling Center, 3000 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 138, Washington, DC 20008, (202) 483-0700.

Resources

IRAC LOOKS AT HONG KONG REFUGEE SCREENING

The prolonged, indefinite detention of Vietnamese in Hong Kong violates international human rights guarantees, according to In Search of Asylum: Vietnamese Boat People in Hong Kong, a report now available from the Indo-China Resource Action Center (IRAC).

This 194-page book, with photos, contains a comprehensive analysis of the Hong Kong government's screening process, prospects for repatriation, living conditions in Hong Kong refugee camps, and a legal analysis of their status.

According to Dr. Le Xuan Khoa, IRAC president, the report reveals that the screening process now in place in Hong Kong more accurately reflects the international definition of a refugee than it did before the UN High Commissioner for Refugees became involved in the process. However, problems remain. "The government may be applying a presumption against refugee status or limiting to 10 percent the number of boat people found to be refugees," says Khoa. Also, government interpreters (interviewed by attorney Janelle M. Diller, author of the report) did not always comprehend the applicants' expressions in screening interviews, and no record preserving the original Vietnamese responses is made.

In Search of Asylum urges specific improvements in the detention centers, and appeals to the United Kingdom and Hong Kong governments to process quickly family reunification cases and unaccompanied minors.

According to Khoa, the report "strongly

advises that repatriation be operated on a voluntary basis, and that any agreement require a binding commitment by Vietnam not to penalize returning citizens for having fled, and a guarantee to allow effective monitoring and follow up of returnees by UNHCR."

Included in the appendices are the statement of understanding between the Hong Kong government and UNHCR, the joint communique between the British and Hong Kong governments and Vietnam, and other important reference material.

To order, send $15.00 to IRAC, with your return mailing address. Discounts are available for multiple-copy orders. For further information, contact Meg Nord at IRAC, 1628 16th St., NW, 3rd floor, Washington, DC 20009. (202) 667-4690.

LAWYERS COMMITTEE ISSUES REPORT ON DANGERS TO REFUGEES IN THAILAND

Pushbacks of Vietnamese boat refugees by the Thai government during 1988 have resulted in increased piracy by Thai fisherman, who have ravaged, raped, and killed hundreds of Vietnamese boat people, says Refuge Denied, a report just issued by the Lawyers Committee for Human Rights. At the same time as the need for protection has increased, there has been severe deterioration in an anti-piracy program in Thailand "involving the governments of Thailand and the United States, as well as the United Nations," according to the report.

For Cambodians, there are other dangers, which the report outlines. They are "exposed to cross-border conflict and are victimized by criminals without effective redress or protection," including virtual captivity in some camps by the infamous Khmer Rouge.

Refuge Denied urges an end to pushbacks and piracy, and calls upon the Thai government to "ensure respect for the basic human rights of Vietnamese boat people." It asks the Thai government to "take measures to improve living conditions in all camps, addressing such points as chronic overcrowding and mental health problems." It finds that the procedures used to admit Indochinese refugees into the United States are "unfair". According to the report, "applicants are not represented by counsel..., are not informed of the basis for a decision denying them refugee status, and have only limited rights of appeal."

Copies of the report are available for $10.00 from the Lawyers Committee for Human Rights, 330 Seventh Avenue, 10th Floor North, New York, NY 10001. (212) 629-6170.

WHAT ABOUT THE CONTRAS?

As U.S. funding for the contras dries up, speculation intensifies concerning their future. If the War in Nicaraguan Ends: Where Will the Contras Go? A Discussion Paper examines a variety of mechanisms through which former contras might enter the United States, including overseas refugee admissions, parole, immigrant and nonimmigrant channels, asylum, extended voluntary departure (EVD) or benign neglect.

The paper discusses provisions in the Contadora and Arias peace plans for the return of displaced persons, but notes that solutions within the region will depend on policies of each of the countries involved. "While officially welcoming any who want to return, it is unlikely that the Nicaraguan government would want all of the contras to return home," the report observes. Costa Rica and Honduras are shown to be ambivalent about contras staying in their lands.

The report cites an October 10 New York Times article in which the U.S. government was said to have assured Honduras that it "recognizes and accepts responsibility" for resettling the contras.

RPG doesn't itself come down in support of one solution over another, but concludes that the United States, Central American countries, and the international community should be consulting now on how best to deal with the contras' situation.

The report is available for $6.25 from RPG, 1424 16th St., NW, Suite 401, Washington, DC 20036. (202) 387-3015.

In the December 16, 1988 issue of Refugee Reports, the chart on page 6 contains two typographical errors. The number for Highland Lao at Chiang Khan camp should read 15,963. The number for Khmer at Khao I Dang should read 13,963. We thank a careful reader for pointing out these errors to us.

PLANNED ADJUSTMENTS TO FY 89 FUNDED REGIONAL REFUGEE ADMISSIONS CEILINGS*

I. ORIGINAL PLAN--As of September 1988

	84,000 Fully Funded	6,000 Semi-Funded	Total Level
AFRICA	2,000	--	2,000
S.E. ASIA--1ST ASYLUM	27,000	1,000	28,000
S.E. ASIA--ODP	22,500	2,500	25,000
E. EUROPE/SOVIET UNION	22,500	2,000	24,500
EASTERN EUROPE	(6,500)	(--)	(6,500)
SOVIET UNION	(16,000)	(2,000)	(18,000)
LATIN AMERICA	3,500	--	3,500
NEAR EAST & SOUTH ASIA	6,500	500	7,000
TOTAL	84,000	6,000	90,000

II. NEW PLAN

	84,000 Fully Funded	6,000 Semi-Funded	Total Level
AFRICA	2,000	--	2,000
S.E. ASIA--1ST ASYLUM	27,000	--	27,000
S.E. ASIA--ODP	19,500	--	19,500
E. EUROPE/SOVIET UNION	25,500	6,000	31,500
EASTERN EUROPE	(6,500)	(--)	(6,500)
SOVIET UNION	(19,000)	(6,000)	(25,000)
LATIN AMERICA	3,500	--	3,500
NEAR EAST & SOUTH ASIA	6,500	--	6,500
TOTAL	84,000	6,000	90,000

* According to the State Department, allocations as shown in new plan assume the status of reeducation center detainee negotiations with Vietnam as of January 1, 1989, permits reallocation of 3,000 fully funded numbers from ODP, and that availability of private funding will result in all 6,000 semi-funded numbers being used by Soviets. Depending upon the availability of private funding, some of the 6,000 semi-funded numbers might instead be used for refugees from Eastern Europe, the Near East, or Southeast Asia.
Source: U.S. State Department

REFUGEE REPORTS is published monthly for $35.00 per year for one subscription, $25.00 each for two or more subscriptions to the same addressee, or $25.00 each for ten or more subscriptions requested at the same time, mailed to separate addresses; overseas postage is an additional $24.00 for second class or an additional $75.00 for airmail; by ACNS, 95 Madison Avenue, Third Floor, New York, NY 10016. Second Class Postage paid at New York and additional mailing offices. POSTMASTER: send address changes to *Refugee Reports*, Sunbelt Fulfillment Services, P.O. Box 41094, Nashville, TN 37204.

Editorial comments and inquiries should be sent to: *Refugee Reports*, 1025 Vermont Avenue NW, Suite 920, Washington, DC 20005. All communications regarding subscriptions should be sent to: *Refugee Reports* Subscriptions, Sunbelt Fulfillment Services, P.O. Box 41094, Nashville, TN 37204. (615) 377-3322.

Basic subscription rate for 12 issues per year: $35.00; Multiple-copy rate: $25.00; Single copies of back issues: $3.00
Editor: Virginia Hamilton; Staff Writers: Bill Frelick, Court Robinson
Distribution Manager: Carolyn Moore; Production Coordinator: Koula Papanicolas
© 1989 American Council for Nationalities Service. Rights of reproduction and redistribution reserved. ISSN 0884-3554.

Refugee Reports

A News Service of the U.S. Committee for Refugees, a Project of the American Council for Nationalities Service
Sunbelt Fulfillment Services
P.O. Box 41094
Nashville, TN 37204

20814KIANKE004 NOV89 26000****
ED KIANKA ACQUISITIONS EDTRR
CONGRESSIONAL INFORMATION SER
4520 EAST-WEST HWY STE 800
BETHESDA MD 20814

Address Correction Requested
Return Postage Guaranteed